LIBRARY
SUPREME COURT, U. S.

Office-Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JUN 9 1969
JOHN F. DAVIS, CLERK

In the

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1969

No. 215

BERNARD SHAPIRO, Welfare Commissioner of State of Connecticut

Appellant,

v.

EDNA SOLMAN, Et Al

Apellees

ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

ROBERT K. KILLIAN
Attorney General
30 Trinity Street
Hartford, Connecticut

FRANCIS J. MACGREGOR
Assistant Attorney General
76 Meadow Street
East Hartford, Connecticut

SUBJECT INDEX

	Page
Judgment Appealed From	1
Opinion Below	1
Jurisdiction	2
Statutes Involved	2
Questions Presented	3
Statement of Facts	3
The Questions are Substantial	5
I. Whether in *Tartaglio* v. *Department of I & A, Division of Public Welfare*, 246 A 2d 483; certiorari denied U.S. Supreme Court, April 28, 1969, the issues of this case have already been decided favorably for the present appellant.	5
II. Whether Section 17-87 (a) of the Connecticut General Statutes is unconstitutional because it allegedly violates the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution	5
A. The alleged equal protection violation	5
B. The alleged due process violation	7
III. Whether Section 17-87 (a) conflicts with the Social Security Acts	8
IV. Whether Section 17-87 (a) conflicts with the United States Supreme Court decision in *King* v. *Smith*, 392 U.S. 309	9

V. Whether the Three-Judge Court erred: First, by not allowing testimony in the Lower Court as to the willingness before marriage of the stepfathers to care for and support the step-children to be; and Second, by not allowing appellant to show that these stepfathers were the persons financing the divorces and in fact breaking up the marriages of the appellees 11

VI. Could the Court grant damages to the appellees when it found no unconstitutional action on the part of the appellant 12

Conclusion 13

Appendix

A. Opinion of the United States District Court, District of Connecticut 14

B. Connecticut General Statutes, Section 17-87 (a) 25

C. Judgment 26

TABLE OF CITATIONS

Cases Cited	Page
American Federation of Labor v. *Watson*, 327 U.S. 582	2
Anderson National Bank v. *Luckett*, 321 U.S. 233	8
Breithaupt v. *Abram*, 352 U.S. 432	8
Douglas v. *City of Jeannette, Pa.*, 130 F 2d 653; 319 U.S. 157	8
Ferguson v. *Skrupa*, 312 U.S. 726	7
King v. *Smith*, 392 U.S. 309	3, 5, 9, 11
Lewis v. *Stark* ____ Fed. Sup. ____	9
Monaco v. *Mississippi*, 292 U.S. 490	12
Morey v. *Dowd*, 354 U.S. 457	6
New York, ex parte State of, 256 U.S. 490	12
Percy v. *Montgomery* ____ Fed. Sup. ____	9
Rockin v. *California*, 342 U.S. 165	7
Tartaglio v. *Department of I & A, Division of Public Welfare*, 246 A 2d 483	3, 5, 8, 12
United States v. *Georgia Public Service Commission*, 371 U.S. 285	2

Statutes: Cited	
28 U.S.C. 1343 (3)	2

28 U.S.C. 2281 2

28 U.S.C. 1253 2

42 U.S.C. 1983 2

42 U.S.C. 1988 2

Section 17-87 (a) Connecticut General Statutes 2, 3, 4

REGULATIONS: CITED

45 C.F.R. 203.1; 33 Fed. Reg. 11290 8

In the

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1968

No.

BERNARD SHAPIRO, Welfare Commissioner of State of Connecticut

Appellant,

v.

EDNA SOLMAN, Et Al

Appellees

ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

Judgment Appealed From

Appellant, Bernard Shapiro, Commissioner of Welfare, State of Connecticut, appeals from the final judgment of the specially-constituted United States District Court for the District of Connecticut. Appellant submits this statement to show that the Supreme Court of the United States has jurisdiction of the appeal and that substantial questions are presented.

OPINION BELOW

The Opinion of the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut which is the subject of this appeal is not yet reported. A copy of the Opinion is attached hereto as Appendix A.

Jurisdiction

This action was brought by the appellee (plaintiff) in the U. S. District Court for the District of Connecticut under 42 U.S.C. Sections 1983 and 1988 and 28 U.S.C. 1343 (3) to declare Chapter 299, Section 17-87 (a) of the Connecticut General Statutes unlawful and unenforceable as it contravenes the United States Constitution, and it enjoins the appellant (defendant) from enforcing said statute against the appellees (plaintiffs), and it gives the appellees (plaintiffs) money damages because the enforcement of said statute has impaired her rights under Article IV, Section 2 (1) and Article XIV, Section 1 of the United States Constitution.

A special three judge court was convened to determine the cause pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Section 2281 et seq. In due course the matter was heard and an opinion was rendered on April 10, 1969 in favor of the appellees (plaintiffs) and a judgment pursuant to the opinion was entered on April 11, 1969 in her favor. From this judgment the appellant (defendant) has appealed.

The jurisdiction of the Supreme Court to review by direct appeal is conferred by 28 U.S.C. 1253. The following decisions sustain the jurisdiction of this Court to review a judgment on direct appeal from a three judge court:

United States v. *Georgia Public Service Commission*, 371 U.S. 285, 287.

American Federation of Labor v. *Watson*, 327 U.S. 582, 591.

Statutes Involved

Section 17-87 (a) of the Connecticut General Statutes is the statute involved and this statute is set forth in Appendix B which is attached hereto.

Questions Presented

The following questions are presented by this appeal.

A. Whether in *Tartaglio* v. *Department of I & A, Division of Public Welfare,* 246 A 2d 483; Certiorari denied U.S. Supreme Court, April 28, 1969, the issues of this case have already been decided favorable for the present appellant.

B. Whether Section 17-87 (a) is unconstitutional because it allegedly violates the 14th Amendment Section I of the United States Constitution.

C. Whether Section 17-87 (a) conflicts with the Social Security Act particularly the Sections in 42 U.S.C. 601-609.

D. Whether Section 17-87 (a) conflicts with the Supreme Court decision in *King* v. *Smith,* 392 U.S. 309.

E. Whether the three judge court erred: (1) by not allowing testimony in the lower court as to the willingness before marriage of the stepfathers to assume the support and care of the stepchildren to be. (2) by not allowing the appellant to show that the stepfathers were the persons who financed the divorces and in fact broke up the marriages of the appellees.

F. Could the Court grant damages to the appellees in the present case.

Statement of Facts

1. The appellees were the supervising relatives and the beneficiaries of Connecticut's aid to dependent children program until the remarriage of the adult female appellees to their present husbands.

Since the marriage to the present stepfathers, the appellant has either taken the children of these women off the aid

to dependent children program or reduced the welfare grant for these children below the amount that the child would have received if its mother had not remarried and was still on the aid to dependent children program.

3. The present stepfathers have now expressed the opinion that they are not willing to support the stepchildren of their respective marriages.

4. The appellant, pursuant to Section 17-87 (a) of the Connecticut General Statutes will give no financial assistance to the appellees if their income in the home is above the welfare standards for that area plus additional allowances as setup in Manual Volume I, Chapter 3, Section 345.3 of the Social Services Policies of Public Assistance.

5. If the income in the appellees' home is below welfare standards, the defendant welfare commissioner will give sufficient aid to bring it up to the standards plus additional allowances.

6. Under Section 17-87 (a) a stepfather with a family consisting of himself a wife and four stepchildren would be entitled to get welfare benefits for the children if he brought home a pay of less than $422.55 a month. This would be a minimum figure in Connecticut.

7. Under Section 17-87 (a) the same stepfather with a wife and four stepchildren could be making in excess of $800 a month and still get welfare benefits for the stepchildren.

8. In Connecticut 75% of the women on welfare with their children get remarried shortly after their divorce.

The Questions are Substantial

I.

WHETHER IN *TARTAGLIO* v. *DEPARTMENT OF I & A, DIVISION OF PUBLIC WELFARE,* 246 A 2d 483; CERTIORARI DENIED U. S. SUPREME COURT, APRIL 28, 1969, THE ISSUES OF THIS CASE HAVE ALREADY BEEN DECIDED FAVORABLY FOR THE PRESENT APPELLANT.

On April 28, 1969, this Supreme Court denied certiorari in an appeal from the State of New Jersey in *Tartaglio* v. *Department of I & A, Division of Public Welfare,* 246 A 2d 483. The stepfather statute in New Jersey allows the welfare commissioner to consider the stepfather's earnings as available for the support of his stepchildren even though the state law does not obligate him to furnish such support. This statute is very similar in language to Section 17-87 (a), the statute in question in the present case.

One of the grounds upon which reversal was sought in the *Tartaglio* case was the decision in *King* v. *Smith,* 392 U.S. 309. A reading of the Three Judge Court's opinion in the present case would also indicate that their decision was based on the *King* case. However in the *Tartaglio* case it is obvious that the present Supreme Court did not think that *King* v. *Smith* was applicable in the stepfather cases.

II.

WHETHER SECTION 17-87 (a) OF THE CONNECTICUT GENERAL STATUTES IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL BECAUSE IT ALLEGEDLY VIOLATES THE 14th AMENDMENT TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION.

A. THE ALLEGED EQUAL PROTECTION VIOLATION:

Unless this Court is prepared to say that Section 17-87 (a) is constitutionally suspect legislation on its face, it would appear that the statute meets the four rules for testing discrimination in social legislation set forth in *Morey* v. *Dowd*, 354 U.S. 457, 463-464. First, the equal protection clause does not deprive the state of a wide scope of discretion and a statute having a reasonable basis will be upheld. Second, a failure of mathematical nicety or creation of some inequality is not offensive to the equal protection clause. Third, a classification will be sustained, if any state of facts can be reasonably conceived that would sustain it. Fourth, the burden is on the attacker to show no reasonable basis.

The Connecticut statute has done only what stepfathers traditionally have done before the days of state public assistance. If support was not forthcoming from the natural father, the stepfather supported, cared for, and disciplined the stepchildren. In many cases the stepfather adopted the stepchildren. If the Lower Court decision is upheld, the stepfathers would now have a monetary incentive not to adopt these stepchildren, a result certainly not consistent with public policy.

Connecticut like most states has been faced with an increasing burden of AFDC payments. It would seem because of this that Connecticut should limit their aid to the really needy and exclude children where there is a person who can in fact support and who has traditionally taken up this burden.

The Court should note from the Statement of Facts supported by the testimony in this case that the Connecticut law was not aimed at poor stepfathers, who are aided under the public assistance program, something that a natural father living with the family would not be entitled to.

Finally no evidence was presented by the appellees to

overcome the presumption of constitutionality which is required when social legislation, not racially aimed and not constitutionally suspect, is attacked.

B. THE ALLEGED DUE PROCESS VIOLATION.

The appellant assumes from the briefs filed by appellees that this is a claimed violation of substantive due process. If this is so, it would appear that the courts should not substitute their own social and economic beliefs for the judgment of the legislative body.

"Legislative bodies have broad scope to experiment about the economic problems, and this Court does not sit to subject the state to an intolerable supervision, hostile to the basic principles of our government, and wholly beyond the protection which the general clause of the 14th Amendment was intended to secure." *Ferguson* v. *Skrupa,* 372 U.S. 726, 730.

The question does arise what protection did the due process clause intend to secure? The appellant in the present case claims that the due process clause means exactly what the Court in *Rockin* v. *People of California,* 342 U.S. 165, 169 said it meant.

"Due process is a summarized constitutional guarantee of respect for those personal immunities which are so rooted in the traditions and conscience of our people as to be ranked as fundamental or are explicit in the concept of ordered liberty."

Certainly a stepfather, who knowingly enters a marriage where there are children and takes care of these children, upsets no traditional concept or no concept of ordered liberty. Also there is no violation of the sense of fairness and decency in requesting a stepfather who is financially able to support

his stepchildren. Actually the fundamental test in due process is fairness as judged by the average member of the community not a Three Judge Federal Court. "Due process is not measured by the yardstick of personal reaction or the sphygmogram of the most sensitive person, but by the whole community sense of decency and fairness that has been woven by common experience into the fabric of acceptable conduct." *Breithaupt v. Abram,* 352 U.S. 432, 436. See also *Douglas* v. *City of Jeannette, Pa.,* 130 F 2d 652, 657 & 658; affirmed 319 U.S. 157.

Finally the fact that stepfathers have fulfilled this job of supporting stepchildren for so many years should cause this Court to be very reluctant in interfering with legislation that merely codifies the status quo.

"The fact that a procedure is so old as to have become customary and well established in a community is of great weight in determining whether it conforms to due process for 'not lightly vacated is the verdict of quiescent years' ". *Anderson National Bank* v. *Luckett,* 321 U.S. 233, 244.

III.

WHETHER SECTION 17-87 (a) CONFLICTS WITH THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACTS.

One of the reasons the Three Judge Court reached its decision was because of the HEW regulation which states that a stepfather's income can only be considered if he is legally obligated to support the children under a state law of general applicability. 45 CFR 203.1, 33 Fed. Reg. 11290. By doing this the Lower Court has evidently rejected this Court's interpretation when it denied certiorari in *Tartaglio,* Supra. Also there is no language in the Social Security Law that remotely supports the HEW regulation.

Finally the appellant would urge the Court to follow the rejection of this HEW regulation by following the same rationale that motivated the Three Judge Federal Court for the Northern District of California. In companion cases No. 50238, *Lewis* v. *Stark,* and No. 50285 *Percy, et al* v. *Montgomery* that Federal Court said that the Social Security Act does not instruct states to consider only resources guaranteed by the legal consequences of a marital or biological relationship. Nor does the Act instruct the states to consider only resources whose receipt by the child has been proved.

IV.

WHETHER SECTION 17-87 (a) CONFLICTS WITH THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT DECISION IN *KING V. SMITH,* 392 U.S. 309.

In attempting to equate Section 17-87 (a) with the Alabama regulation involving *King* v. *Smith,* Supra the plaintiffs have ignored the historical and social realities of this country. No community in America ever expected that the casual paramour of a woman would be expected to support her children unless he were the father. In fact it would have been unusual and wholly unexpected for him to do so. But because of society's dislike for the type of conduct exhibited in the *King* case the legislatures have passed various criminal statutes to punish and discourage this flaunting of promiscuity in the community. Alabama, with all these criminal statutes at her disposal, attempted to impose a wholly artificial type of discouragement to this conduct, one without any historical precedence, and one that was aimed at the wrong people. Here the victims were the children.

In contrast with this the community has always expected that when a man entered into a marriage contract with a

woman who had prior children he was knowingly and willingly undertaking the burden of supporting the whole family to the best of his financial ability if it were necessary for him to do so. This Supreme Court from its own experience in life must certainly be aware that stepfathers in the community in which the individual judges grew up, brought up stepchildren without any complaint because it was the accepted, proper, social standard.

In the same context a woman marrying a widower with children clearly expected that she would handle all those duties of the natural mother. It would have been unusual for a stepmother to say to her new husband that he get an outside housekeeper to perform the tasks of taking care of her stepchildren. Just as the natural mother marries the stepfather for the very purpose of support and help with the children so does the widower with children get married. Thus if one follows the argument of the appellees to its logical conclusion, it would seem that the state should furnish and pay for a substitute housekeeper if the new stepmother were disinclined to take on her expected chores.

Another insurmountable problem that was created by the Alabama regulation was the expectation that the paramour should furnish support regardless of his financial ability, thus ignoring the economic realities of life. The Connecticut statute explicitly takes this problem into consideration and merely says that the stepfather's income shall be taken into consideration if the children apply for aid. It clearly follows, if the standard set down by the welfare commissioner shows that the stepfather has insufficient income to furnish a decent way of life, then the State of Connecticut will contribute the difference or if necessary take up the entire burden. If, however the natural mother marries a millionaire, there is a reasonable expectation that he will be able to take care of the children.

The Connecticut Statute was not passed to punish or discourage anyone. The statute merely codified what was already an accepted social fact, and actually the State of Connecticut went even further by offering to ease any burden if it were too heavy.

If the Lower Court decision in the present case is allowed to stand the unfortunate result will be that it is the Federal Courts who will be actually determining who is needy for purposes of AFDC, and it will be the Courts who will be imposing the eligibility requirements as to means. This certainly runs counter to this Court's statement in *King,* Supra, footnote 14, where the Court said ". . . and legislative history of the act also makes it clear that the states should have the power to determine who is needy for purposes of AFDC." And further along "thus the reports of the House Ways and Means Committee and Senate Finance Committee make clear that the states are free to impose eligibility requirements as to means."

V.

WHETHER THE THREE JUDGE COURT ERRED: FIRST, BY NOT ALLOWING TESTIMONY IN THE LOWER COURT AS TO THE WILLINGNESS BEFORE MARRIAGE OF THE STEPFATHERS TO CARE FOR AND SUPPORT THE STEPCHILDREN TO BE; AND SECOND, BY NOT ALLOWING APPELLANT TO SHOW THAT THESE STEPFATHERS WERE THE PERSONS FINANCING THE DIVORCES AND IN FACT BREAKING UP THE MARRIAGES OF THE APPELLEES.

During the trial the appellant called one John Hayes to testify. The appellees conceded his qualifications and there was no question that the records from which he was testifying were admissible as business records. Appellees' objection was based on confidentiality. However Section 17-83 (a) the con-

fidentiality statute waives confidentiality if the disclosure is to carry out the purpose of the AFDC chapter. The purpose of the testimony to be elicited was that the stepfathers could support the stepchildren, and just prior to the marriage said that they were willing to care for these children. This willingness would have put the case within the facts of *Tartaglio*, Supra. Another purpose of the offer was to show that in these cases the stepfathers were financing the divorces and were breaking up the marriage. Thus, if the appellees' contentions were upheld, the person breaking up the marriage will end up with a monetary gift from the state, a situation not particularly consistent with good public policy. It is the appellant's feeling that he should have been allowed to pursue the testimony as to these facts.

VI.

COULD THE COURT GRANT DAMAGES TO THE APPELLEES WHEN IT FOUND NO UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTION ON THE PART OF THE APPELLANT.

The Lower Court Three Judge decision was not based on any unconstitutional action of the appellant but merely his claimed failure to follow HEW regulations. The Social Security Acts clearly define what the punishment is if a state does not follow the statutes. That state is deprived of its pro rata share of federal aid. There is nothing else in the statute about allowing welfare recipients to sue the state. It would seem further that an award of money damages to the appellees would be improper unless Connecticut had consented to be sued for money damages in this type of action. *Monaco* v. *Mississippi*, 292 U.S. 313, 324; *Ex parte State of New York No. 1*, 256 U.S. 490, 497.

Conclusion

The questions involved here are substantial and ought to be resolved by this Court. This Court would have appeared, to have reached the opposite conclusion by failing to grant certiorari in *Tartaglio,* Supra. Also a similar issue has been decided in opposite to the present Three Judge Court by a similar Three Judge Court in California.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT K. KILLIAN
Attorney General
30 Trinity Street
Hartford, Connecticut

By
FRANCIS J. MACGREGOR
Assistant Attorney General
76 Meadow Street
East Hartford, Connecticut

APPENDIX A

United States District Court

District of Connecticut

EDNA SOLMAN, on her own behalf and as next friend of VANCE GOSMAN and JAMES SOLMAN, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated

— v. —

BERNARD SHAPIRO, Commissioner of Welfare, State of Connecticut

} Civil 12,790

Before: Smith, *C. J.* and Blumenfeld and Clarie, *D. JJ.*

MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

Blumenfeld, *District Judge:*

Plaintiffs bring this class action[1] to challenge the validity of a statute relating to the administration of that part of Connecticut's comprehensive scheme of public assistance relating to Aid to Families With Dependent Children (AFDC). *See* Conn. Gen. Stats. §§ 17-84 to 17-107.[2] They are all recip-

---

[1]Prior to the trial of this action several plaintiffs intervened in order to obtain temporary restraining orders against termination of aid grounded on the statute in issue. The action is properly a class action, however, under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a) and (b)(2), since the prerequisites of subsection (a) are met and since "the party opposing the class has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the class, thereby making appropriate final injunctive relief or corresponding relief with respect to the class as a whole . . ." *See* Notes of Advisory Committee on Rules, 28 App. U.S.C. Rule 23, at 1605 (Supp. III 1968): "Illustrative [of subsection (b)(2)] are various actions in the civil-rights field where a party is charged with discriminating unlawfully against a class, usually one whose members are incapable of specific enumeration." Because this action falls under subsection (b)(2), the notice requirements specified in subsection (c)(2) are not applicable.

[2]Connecticut along with every other state participates in the federal government's Aid to Families With Dependent Children program, under which the state receives substantial payments for federally approved plans of state aid to needy families with children. *See* 42 U.S.C. §§ 601, 602.

ients of AFDC benefits which the defendant has threatened to curtail in whole or part in each case because the needy children have a stepfather living in the house. Specifically, they challenge § 17-87(a) insofar as it provides that in determining the need of an AFDC recipient who has a stepparent, the income of the stepparent shall be considered as available for the support of the recipient. Plaintiffs contend that since a stepparent in Connecticut is not legally obligated to support the stepchild, *see Conn. Gen. Stats.* § 17-320, § 17-87(a) is inconsistent with Part A of Subchapter IV of the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 601-610, with federal regulations promulgated thereunder, 45 C.F.R. § 203.1, and with the due process and equal protection clauses of the fourteenth amendment.

The cause of action is based on 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and jurisdiction is founded on 28 U.S.C. § 1343.[3] Since plaintiffs seek an injunction restraining enforcement of a state statute on constitutional grounds that are not insubstantial, *cf. Utica Mut. Ins. Co.* v. *Vincent*, 375 F. 2d 129, 130 (2d Cir.), *cert. denied*, 389 U.S. 839 (1967), a three-judge district court has been convened pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2281, 2284.[4]

---

[3]*See King* v. *Smith*, 392 U.S. 309 (1968). In that case, almost identical with the present one, jurisdiction was founded on §§ 1343(3) and (4), since an equal protection claim was presented. The Court pointed out:

> "We intimate no views as to whether and under what circumstances suits challenging state AFDC provisions only on the ground that they are inconsistent with the federal statute may be brought in federal courts." *Id.* at 312 n.3.

Thus, even though the case was decided on statutory grounds alone, the presence of a constitutional claim was sufficient to resolve the jurisdictional question.

[4]In *King* v. *Smith*, 392 U.S. 309 (1968), the Supreme Court held that a three-judge district court was properly convened. Where both substantial constitutional claims and claims based on a conflict between state and federal laws are asserted, as here, a three-judge district court is required even if the constitutional issues are not reached and the injunction is issued on supremacy grounds alone. *Brotherhood of Locomotive Eng'rs.* v. *Chicago, R. I. & Pac. R. R.*, 382 U.S. 423 (1966); *see Florida Lime & Avocado Growers, Inc.* v. *Jacobsen*, 362 U.S. 73 (1960).

The portion of the statute challenged, Conn. Gen. Stats. § 17-87(a), provides in part:

> "In the determination of such need [of the dependent children], the ability and income of a stepparent shall be considered as available for the support of the family, including himself, his wife, and his minor stepchild or stepchildren residing with him . . ."

The statute is implemented by a regulation which provides in part:

> "When an employed stepparent is in the home, eligibility in regard to the need requirements exists only if the stepparent's income together with other available income is insufficient to meet total family need . . . ."[5] 1 Conn. State Welfare Manual § 345.3.

Under the scheme of cooperative federalism for carrying out the AFDC program, state plans for distribution of aid must conform with federal laws and regulations, in order for the state to receive federal funds. 42 U.S.C. §§ 602, 1302. One such regulation is 45 C.F.R. § 203.1, which reads in part:

> "(a) A State plan for aid and services to needy families with children under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act, to be approved under section 402 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 602), must provide that the determination whether a child has been deprived of parental support or care by reason of the death, continued absence from the home, or physical or mental incapacity of a parent, or (if the State plan includes such cases) the unemployment of his father, will be made only in relation to the child's natural or adoptive parent, or in relation to a

---

[5]There is no provision in either the state statute or regulation that allows the recipients to show that the step-parent's income is in actuality *not* being used for the children's support.

child's *stepparent who is* ceremonially married to the child's natural or adoptive parent and is *legally obligated to support the child under State law* of general applicability, which requires stepparents to support stepchildren to the same extent that natural or adoptive parents are required to support their children.

"(b) *The inclusion in the family, or the presence in the home,* of a 'substitute parent' or 'man-in-the-house' or *any individual other than one described in paragraph (a) of this section is not an acceptable basis* for a finding of ineligibility or *for assuming the availability of income by the State.* . . . [I]n the consideration of all income and resources in establishing financial eligibility *and the amount of the assistance payment,* only such income as is actually available for current use on a regular basis will be considered, *and the income only of the parent described in paragraph (a) of this section will be considered available for children in the household in absence of proof of actual contributions.*" 45 C.F.R. § 203.1, 33 Fed. Reg. 11290 (emphasis added).

This federal regulation was issued in the wake of the Supreme Court's decision in *King* v. *Smith,* 392 U.S. 309 (1968). In that case the validity of Alabama's "substitute father" regulation was challenged. Under it, Alabama had denied AFDC payments to the children of a mother who cohabited with any single or married able-bodied man. Alabama's regulation was based on an interpretation it gave to the definition of "dependent child" in 42 U.S.C. § 606(a): "a needy child (1) who has been deprived of parental support or care by reason of the death, continued absence from the home, or physical or mental incapacity of a *parent,* and who is living with [any of several listed relatives] . . . ." (Emphasis added.) Alabama considered the "substitute father" not to be an absent "parent" within the federal statute, and con-

sequently held that a child in such a home did not qualify as "a dependent child."

The Supreme Court rejected this analysis. It noted that under Alabama law a "substitute father" was not among those legally obligated to support the child. The Court went on:

> "The question for decision here is whether Congress could have intended that a man was to be regarded as a child's parent so as to deprive the child of AFDC eligibility despite the circumstances: (1) that the man did not in fact support the child; and (2) that he was not legally obligated to support the child. . . . We think the answer is quite clear: Congress must have meant by the term 'parent' an individual who owed to the child a state-imposed legal duty of support." 392 U.S. at 329.

It follows from this detailed analysis by the Supreme Court that Connecticut's statute providing that "the income of a stepparent shall be considered as available for the support of his minor . . . stepchildren residing with him" squarely contravenes the regulation which states that that "is not an acceptable basis . . . for assuming the availability of income by the State." Connecticut does not have a state law of general applicability imposing an obligation on a stepfather to support his minor stepchildren. *Ladd* v. *Welfare Comm'r*, 3 Conn. Cir. 504, 507 n.5 (1965). *See* Conn. Gen. Stats. § 17-320.

In an attempt to avoid the full thrust of *King* v. *Smith*, the state asks us to focus attention on a different provision of the federal statutes where parental relationship is not a factor bearing upon a child's qualification for benefit payments but is claimed to affect only the amount of such payments. The section is 42 U.S.C. § 602(a) (7), the relevant portion of which provides that the state welfare agency "shall, in deter-

mining need, take into consideration any other income and resources of any child or relative claiming [AFDC], *or of any other individual (living in the same house as such child and relative) whose needs the State determines should be considered in determining the need of the child or relative claiming such aid . . .*" (Emphasis added.) Using this text, the state argues that since the income of the stepfather living in the home is taken into account only in determining the "total family need," it is not relying upon the stepfather's income to find a stepchild *ineligible* for assistance under § 606(a), and, therefore, *King* v. *Smith is inapposite.*

Since the state relies upon this emphasized portion of § 602(a) (7) to support the action it has taken against these plaintiffs, the question of its applicability must be examined. If the theory of the state rests on the conclusion that the needs "of any other individual (living in the same house as such child . . .) whose needs the State determines should be considered in determining the need of the child" permit it to take into account the income of the stepparent to reduce or discontinue the payments for aid to stepchildren, it misreads the statute. The textually interlocked "other individual" has a special meaning.

Essential Person

Of course, what standards of welfare assistance a state may adopt which will qualify for its receipt of federal funds depends on the Social Security Act. A state's plan may provide for certain special needs, not necessary for all individuals. Section 602(a) (7) recognizes the validity of such a type of special need.[6] It takes into account cases where it is

---

[6]The portion of § 602(a)(7) emphasized above was introduced into the Act by the amendment of 1968. Pub. L. 90-248, § 202(a). The Report of the Committee on Ways and Means describes the new provision and states that it "makes no change in present law." H.R. Rep. No. 544, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. at 174 (1967).

found desirable to provide a qualified recipient of assistance with something more than what is necessary for mere physical subsistence. An example would be a case of a child whose mother works and there is also another child in the family above the age for eligibility for aid to dependent children. However, the state may consider that the continued presence in home of the older child is essential to the *well-being* of the younger child (as distinguished from the necessaries to support life) and serves to strengthen family life, and thus may include his needs in the family budget. Although the need of the older child is met, it is not a "recipient" of benefits.

Thus, in such a case, under § 602(a) (7) an individual living in the house whose needs and income "should be considered *in determining the need of the child or relative claiming such aid*" is called by those in charge of administering AFDC an "essential person." The Department of Health, Education and Welfare's (HEW) "essential person" rule permits a state "to establish the need of the individual on a basis that recognizes as essential to him the presence in the home of other needy persons . . . ." IV Handbook of Public Assistance Admin. § 3131(4). Accordingly in any case where there is a decision that an "essential person" is necessary, although ineligible in his own right for public assistance, *his* needs could be "comprehended in the [eligible] individual's need." *Id.* The effect of the rule, therefore, enlarges the eligible individual's budget to comprehend the needs of the "essential person" as well as his own. In other words, needs and income of an "essential person" are taken into account only to determine whether the recipient's budget should be enlarged. One who serves as an "essential person" may or may not have needs of his own depending on his resources or income, but he is not the relative or child claiming aid, and is not, therefore, a "recipient" of aid. The answer to whether one who happens to be an "essential person" is *obligated* to provide support for the recipient must be sought elsewhere.

Furthermore a state's plan which provides a basis for recognizing that another person's presence in the home is essential to the well-being of a recipient is one thing. Who decides whether that particular individual is essential is another. HEW's "essential person" rule provides:

> "A State plan . . . must . . .
>
> * * * *
>
> "[6] (ii) Provide that the decision as to whether any individual will be recognized as essential to the recip ient's well-being shall rest with the recipient." Regulations on "Need-Requirements for State Public Assistance Plans," item 3.B.6, Interim Policy Statement No. 4 (33 Fed. Reg. 10230 (1968)).

In these cases, each of which involves a stepparent, only the children and the mothers are recipients, i.e., "claiming aid," and in none of them has a recipient chosen a stepfather as an "essential person." The defendant does not have the right to designate or to assume that a stepfather is an essential person to invoke the operation of § 602(a) (7).

Resources of Child or Relative.

The alternative clause in the section furnishes no support for the state's theory. Stripped of any characterization of the stepfather as an "essential person," the state may not assume that the stepparent's "income and resources" are available for the support of the child under § 602(a) (7). In adverting to this same section of the Act in *King* v. *Smith*, the Supreme Court gave a narrow reading to "resources of any child or relative." It stated:

> "Regulation of HEW, which clearly comport with the statute, restrict the resources which are to be taken into

> account under § 602 to those 'that are, *in fact,* available to an applicant or recipient for current use on a regular basis . . . .' [Citing IV Handbook of Public Assistance Admin. § 3131(7)]. This regulation *properly excludes from consideration resources which are merly assumed to be available to the needy individual.*" 392 U.S. at 319 n. 16 (emphasis added).

In light of this interpretation of § 602(a) (7) by the Supreme Court, the state's reliance on that clause of that section is misplaced.

With respect to children who are beneficiaries of AFDC payments, the income of a stepparent cannot be assumed to be available to his stepchildren living in the same home with him. The stepfather is neither a "relative claiming aid" nor an essential person. His income or his resources may be taken into consideration only if they are actually available for the use of the children. To permit the Welfare Commissioner to predict that every stepfather will support his minor stepchildren, and even more demandingly, to conclusively presume that he will do so would also be at odds with the federal regulation. Where the support of a child is at stake, the only relevant circumstance which may relieve the state of its duty to provide AFDC support for a needy child is whether its stepfather did in fact support the child.

There is no doubt that the state may properly take into account amounts actually expended by the stepparent in support of the stepchildren. See *King* v. *Smith,* 392 U.S. at 319. But the flat provision of the Connecticut statute requires that "the income of a stepparent shall be considered as available for the support of the . . . stepchild" whether so used or not. Since the stepparent is not under a legal duty to support the stepchild under Connecticut law (and because the stepparent may not be assumed to be an "es-

sential person"), Conn. Gen. Stats. § 17-87(a), on its face and as applied, is in contravention of 42 U.S.C. § 602(a)(7) as interpreted in *King* v. *Smith* and of the regulations issued by HEW. See *King* v. *Smith,* 392 U.S. at 333 n. 34; *Ivanhoe Irrigation Dist.* v. *McCracken,* 357 U.S. 275, 295 (1958). This conclusion makes it unnecessary to consider plaintiffs' constitutional claims. See *King* v. *Smith,* 392 U.S. at 333. Accordingly, the court DECREES and ADJUDGES that judgment enter permanently enjoining the defendant from withholding or reducing payments to the plaintiffs and other members of the class on the ground that they are barred from receiving such assistance under the stepparent provisions of § 17-87(a) of the Connecticut General Statutes or the regulations promulgated thereunder to the same extent and on the same terms as now provided by the temporary injunction heretofore issued.

Retroactive Damages

In addition to injunctive relief, the plaintiffs seek retroactive payments of amounts wrongfully withheld pursuant to § 17-87(a). Connecticut welfare regulations applicable to fair hearing procedures by the state welfare department provide that "a decision [at a fair hearing] in favor of appellant applies retroactively to the date the incorrect action was taken." Conn. State Welfare Manual § 6300(7). *See* IV Handbook of Public Assistance Admin. § 6200(k). These provisions reflect the federal policy as stated by HEW in a letter to all state welfare agencies:

> "Federal policy provides that effective July 1, 1968, corrective payments are to be made retroactively to the date incorrect action was taken when a hearing decision is favorable to the claimant . . . ." State Letter No. 1048, from the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare to State Agencies Administering Approved Public Assistance Programs, Sept. 30, 1968.

Since the state welfare agency has already established a procedure whereby retroactive damages for payments wrongfully withheld may be determined, the petitioner's prayer for damages is remanded to the Connecticut Department of Welfare for its determination in light of this decision and the applicable regulations of the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Connecticut Department of Welfare. See *Robinson* v. *Washington,* Civ. No. 3399-66 (D. D.C. Nov. 18, 1968).

Dated at Hartford, Connecticut, this day of April, 1969.

J. Joseph Smith
United States Circuit Judge

M. Joseph Blumenfeld
United States District Judge

T. Emmet Clarie
United States District Judge

APPENDIX B

Section 17-87 (a) General Statutes of Connecticut Revised to 1968.

(a) Aid shall be granted on behalf of such dependent child or children and for the needs of such supervising relative to any such relative eligible therefor under this part to an extent adequate to enable the relative caring for such child or children, together with all other available income and support, to maintain a standard of living in the home reasonably compatible with health and decency for such child or children. In the determination of such need, the ability and income of a stepparent shall be considered as available for the support of the family, including himself, his wife, and his minor stepchild or stepchildren residing with him, and a stepparent is defined for the purposes of this section as one who marries the parent of a minor child or children of whom such stepparent is not the actual parent. The amount of the aid shall be determined in accordance with standards of assistance established by the commissioner.

APPENDIX C

United States District Court
District of Connecticut

EDNA SOLMAN, on her own behalf and as next friend of VANCE GOSMAN and JAMES SOLMAN, on behalf of themselves and all
— v. —
BERNARD SHAPIRO, Commissioner of Welfare, State of Connecticut

Civil 12,790

JUDGMENT

The Court having filed its Memorandum of Decision on April 10, 1969, directing that a permanent injunction enter against defendant and that the prayer for retroactive damages be remanded to the Connecticut Department of Welfare,

It is ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED

(1) That the defendant Bernard Shapiro, Commissioner of Welfare, State of Connecticut, his servants, employees, attorneys and all persons in active concert and participation with them are hereby permanently enjoined from withholding or reducing payments to the plaintiffs and other members of the class similarly situated on the ground that they are barred from receiving such assistance under the stepparent provision of Section 17-87 (a) of the Connecticut General Statutes or the regulations promulgated thereunder,

(2) That minor members of the class, whose aid has been terminated or reduced under said statute, be restored to full assistance under Connecticut's aid to Families with Dependent Children Program and that such assistance include full allotments for the following:

Food, Clothing, Personal Incidentals, Household Supplies, Food Stamps, and Medical Assistance, and their proportionate share of Cooking Fuel, Electricity, Hot Water, Heat and Shelter,

(3) That they be restored to any other assistance that is available to recipients of Connecticut's Aid to Families with Dependent Children Program,

(4) That plaintiffs' prayer for retroactive damages for payments wrongfully withheld is hereby remanded to the Connecticut Department of Welfare for its determination in light of this decision and the applicable regulations of the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Connecticut Department of Welfare.

Dated at New Haven, Connecticut this 11th day of April, 1969.

GILBERT C. EARL
Clerk, United States District Court

By THOMAS A. GRIMES
Chief Deputy Clerk

LIBRARY
SUPREME COURT, U. S.

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JUL 2 1969
JOHN F. DAVIS, CLERK

In the

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, [redacted] 1969

No. [redacted] 215

BERNARD SHAPIRO, COMMISSIONER OF WELFARE,
STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
Appellant,
against
EDNA SOLMAN, ET ALS.,
Appellees.

On Appeal From The United States District Court
For the District of Connecticut

MOTION TO AFFIRM

DAVID M. LESSER
605 Congress Avenue
New Haven, Conn.
THOMAS JAY SOLOMON
35 Field Street
Waterbury, Conn.
WILLIAM H. CLENDENEN, JR.
795 Grand Avenue
New Haven, Conn.

FRANCIS X. DINEEN
169 Church Street
New Haven, Conn.
Attorneys for Appellees.

THE MACK CO., NORTH HAVEN, CONN.

INDEX

	PAGE
Questions Presented	1
Statement of the Case	2
Argument:	
I. The decision of this Court in *King* v. *Smith*, 392 U.S. 309 (1968), requires that the stepparent provisions of Section 17-87(a) of the Connecticut General Statutes be invalidated	4
II. In *King* v. *Smith*, 392 U.S. 309 (1968), this Court expressly approved regulations of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare which invalidate the stepparent provisions of Section 17-87(a) of the Connecticut General Statutes	8
III. The 1968 Amendment to 42 U.S.C. §602(a)(7) does not authorize a state to assume that a stepparent's income is available to stepchildren residing in the home	9
IV. The cases upon which appellant relies are inapposite	10
V. The court below did not award retroactive damages to appellees, but properly remanded the question of damages to the Connecticut State Welfare Department	12
Conclusion	13
Appendix	3a

TABLE OF CASES, STATUTES AND AUTHORITIES CITED

CASES

Anderson v. *McCorkle*, Civ. No. 1386-68 (D.C.N.J.) 11

Board of Social Welfare v. *County of Los Angeles*, 27 Cal. 2d 81, 162 P.2d 630 (1945) 12

King v. *Smith*, 392 U.S. 309 (1968) 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12

Lewis v. *Stark*, F. Supp. (N.D. Cal., 1968), CCH Poverty Law Reporter 10,543 11, 12

Maryland v. *Baltimore Radio Show, Inc.*, 338 U.S. 912 (1950) 10

Smith v. *King*, 277 F. Supp. 31 (M.D. Ala., 1967), *aff'd*, *King* v. *Smith*, 392 U.S. 309 (1968) 12

Solman v. *Shapiro*, F. Supp. (D.Conn., 1969), Appellant's Jurisdictional Statement 14 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 12

Tartaglio v. *Department of Institutions and Agencies, Division of Public Welfare*, 102 N.J. Super. 592, 246 A.2d 483 (1968), *cert. denied*, 89 S. Ct. 1594 (1969) 10, 11

Thompson v. *Shapiro*, 270 F. Supp. 331 (D.Conn., 1967), *aff'd*, *Shapiro* v. *Thompson*, 89 S. Ct. 1322 (1969) 12

REGULATIONS

45 C.F.R. §203.1, 33 Fed. Reg. 11290 (1968) 8, 10, 11

IV Handbook of Public Assistance Administration §6200(k) 12

1 Conn. State Welfare Manual:
§332.3 3
§344.3 3
§345.2 3
§345.3 ..... 2, 3, 4, 5, 10
§6300(7) 12

FEDERAL STATUTES:

42 U.S.C.:
§§601-610 ..... 1, 4
§602(a) (7) 7, 9, 10
§602(a) (8) 9
§606(a) 7
Pub. L. No. 90-248, §202 (1968) 9, 10

STATE STATUTES:

Cal. Welf. & Inst. Code §11351 11
Conn. Gen. Stats. §17-87(a) 1, 2, 7, 8

OTHER AUTHORITIES:

H.R. Rep. No. 544, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. (1967) 9
S.R. 744, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. (1967) 9
New Haven Journal Courier, June 4, 1969, at 1, col. 4 5
McRae et al, The Effects of Discontinuance in 1963 on ADC Families with Stepfathers (1965) 5

In the

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1968

No. 1501

BERNARD SHAPIRO, COMMISSIONER OF WELFARE, STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
Appellant,
against
EDNA SOLMAN, ET ALS.,
Appellees.

On Appeal From The United States District Court For the District of Connecticut

MOTION TO AFFIRM

Appellees move the Court to affirm the judgment sought to be reviewed on the appeal, because it is manifest that the questions on which the decision of the cause depends are so unsubstantial as not to need further argument.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Subchapter IV of the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. §§601-610, compels the invalidation of Section 17-87(a) of the Connecticut General Statutes, which requires that the income and ability of a stepparent be considered as available for the support of minor stepchildren residing with him?

2. Whether the issues presented by this appeal have already been determined in *King* v. *Smith*, 392 U.S. 309 (1968)?

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

As the stipulations recite, the appellant sought to deny, terminate or reduce assistance to the minor appellees under Connecticut's program of Aid to Families With Dependent Children (AFDC), solely because they resided with an employed stepparent who was not legally obligated to support them (R. Doc. Nos. 55, 56, 57, 58). Although each stepparent was unwilling or unable to support the minor appellees, appellant nevertheless refused to grant them the full assistance award to which they were otherwise entitled (*id.*). In several instances, a stepfather provided little or no support for his stepchildren, who were thus without income to meet their basic needs (R. Doc. No. 56 at 1, 3). Most of the minor appellees received no aid from their natural fathers, who had abandoned all responsibilities toward them, or from any other source (R. Doc. Nos. 56 at 1-3, 57 at 1).

But for the fact that they resided with their employed stepparents, who were not required by law to support them, the minor appellees were eligible in every respect for AFDC assistance. As authority for denying them aid, appellant invoked Section 17-87(a) of the Connecticut General Statutes, which requires that, in determining need for AFDC:

> ". . . the ability and income of a stepparent shall be considered as available for the support of . . . his minor stepchild or stepchildren residing with him . . ."

(R. Doc. Nos. 55, 56, 57, 58).

In ascertaining the amount, if any, of a stepchild's AFDC award, the appellant relied upon 1 Conn. State Welfare Manual §345.3:

> "Eligibility in regard to the need requirement exists only if the stepparent's income together with other available income is insufficient to meet total family need determined

on Department standards with additional consideration as specified for exceptional expenses."

The income of a stepparent of moderate means may barely be sufficient to meet total family need on public assistance standards (R. Doc. No. 61), even when consideration is given to his expenses. To support his stepchildren, a stepparent in precarious financial circumstances must choose to support himself, his spouse and any children of the marriage at a level equal to or only slightly above AFDC assistance levels.[1] The

---

[1] In his Jurisdictional Statement at 4 ¶6, appellant asserts that children in a family of six could receive AFDC benefits if their stepfather earned less than $422.55 monthly (R. Doc. No. 59). In fact the stepchildren would be eligible only for the difference between his available income and $422.55, the income required to meet total family need on AFDC assistance standards (R. Doc. No. 59 assumes rental costs of $125.00). AFDC is awarded in an amount "*not to exceed the needs* of the eligible children as determined on Public Assistance standards." 1 Conn. State Welfare Manual §345.3 at 2. Where the stepparent's income is insufficient to support even his spouse at public assistance standards, appellant may additionally grant aid to her which will raise her standard of living to the AFDC level. *Id.* at 3.

Appellant contends, Jurisdictional Statement at 4 ¶7, that a stepparent could earn $800 monthly without rendering his stepchildren ineligible for AFDC assistance. As the stipulations illustrate, in the one instance where a stepparent earned a substantial salary his stepchildren were ineligible for AFDC assistance (R. Doc. No. 56 at 3). In concluding that children whose hypothetical stepparent earned $800 monthly might be nonetheless eligible, appellant gave consideration to expenses for which an AFDC recipient and legally liable relatives are also credited. 1 Conn. State Welfare Manual §§332.3 at 2, 344.3, 345.2 (R. Doc. No. 60). A far more typical situation is presented by the Solman family, where the minor child's AFDC award was terminated because his stepfather earned between $75.00 and $79.00 weekly (R. Doc. Nos. 2 at 5, 56 at 1). Similarly, the stepchildren of Mr. Ramos were faced with a reduced AFDC award because his net weekly income was $75.05 (R. Doc. No. 56 at 3-4).

stepparent is not granted AFDC assistance unless he is incapacitated or unemployed (R. Doc. No. 54 at 19-20). 1 Conn. State Welfare Manual §345.3 at 3.

The court below invalidated the Connecticut Statute and regulation, on the ground of their inconsistency with Subchapter IV of the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. §§601-610. The stepparent's

> "income or his resources may be taken into consideration only if they are actually available for the use of the children. To permit the Welfare Commissioner to predict that every stepfather will support his minor stepchildren, and even more demandingly, to conclusively presume that he will do so would also be at odds with the federal regulation. Where the support of a child is at stake, the only relevant circumstance which may relieve the state of its duty to provide AFDC support for a needy child is whether its stepfather did in fact support the child."
>
> *Solman* v. *Shapiro*, F. Supp. (D.Conn., 1969), Appellant's Jurisdictional Statement 14, 22.

Appellees seek affirmance of the court's opinion.

ARGUMENT

1. The Decision of This Court In King v. Smith, 392 U.S. 309 (1968), Requires That the Stepparent Provisions of Section 17-87(a) of the Connecticut General Statutes Be Invalidated.

In *King* v. *Smith*, 392 U.S. 309 (1968), this Court barred Alabama from denying AFDC assistance to needy children solely because of the presence in their home of a person not legally obligated to support them. *Id.* at 319 n.16, 327, 329-

330, 333 (1968). Additionally this Court noted that stepparents in Alabama had no such obligation. *Id.* at 316 n.10. Similarly, a Connecticut stepparent has no legal duty to support his stepchildren. *Solman* v. *Shapiro*, Appellant's Jurisdictional Statement 14, 18.

Like Alabama's invalidated regulation, Section 17-87(a) renders irrelevant any inquiry into the actual contributions of the stepparent. *Solman* v. *Shapiro*, at 16 n.5. Regardless of need, appellant will not provide full AFDC assistance to children residing with a stepparent whose income is assumed to be available for their support. 1 Conn. State Welfare Manual, §345.3. Connecticut thereby seeks to deprive needy children of AFDC on the ground that they simply reside with an employed stepparent who, like Alabama's "substitute father", cannot be compelled to support them.

Appellant contends that a stepparent's support of his stepchildren is a time-honored practice. Jurisdictional Statement at 8. Appellant, however, cites no authority for this proposition. Subsequent to the decision of the court below, the Connecticut General Assembly refused to pass an amendment which would have created such a support obligation. Amendment rejected June 3, 1969, by House of Representatives. New Haven Journal Courier, June 4, 1969, at 1, col. 4 (reprinted in Appendix 3a).

Appellant further asserts that 75% of AFDC mothers remarry shortly after their divorces. Jurisdictional Statement at 4 #8. Appellant's witness actually testified that of those women who did leave the AFDC rolls, closer to 25% gave remarriage as the "immediate" reason (R. Doc. No. 54 at 11-12). Depriving children of AFDC assistance because a stepparent is in the home, however, can place serious strains on a marriage (R. Doc. Nos. 2, 5, 8), which may result in the dissolution of the family. McRae et al., The Effects of Discontinuance in 1963 on ADC Families with Stepfathers (1965) (Master's Thesis on file at University of Connecticut School of Social Work).

This Court's examination of the legislative history of the Social Security Act reveals that its AFDC provisions were enacted to assist this very class of children whom Connecticut seeks to hold ineligible for the full grant of assistance to which they are entitled. Congress, in passing the Social Security Act, "was deeply concerned with the dire straits in which all needy children in the Nation then found themselves." *King* v. *Smith*, at 327. The AFDC program "was designed to protect . . . 'one clearly distinguishable group of children.'" *Id.* at 328. More specifically,

> "AFDC was intended to provide economic security for children whom Congress could not reasonably expect would be provided for by simply securing employment for family breadwinners. We think it apparent that *neither Congress nor any reasonable person would believe that providing employment for some man who is under no legal duty to support a child would in any way provide meaningful economic security for that child.*" (emphasis supplied)
>
> *Id.* at 329-330.

Congress "expected" that only an employed person "who was legally obligated to support his children", and who resided with his family, would in fact provide that support. *Id.* at 329. The very purpose of the AFDC program, therefore, controverts the expectation or assumption that needy children possess a source of support from one who lacks the legal obligation to provide that support.

Alabama had disqualified needy children through an erroneous interpretation of 42 U.S.C. §606(a) (1964 ed., Supp. III):

> "Congress must have meant by the term 'parent' an individual who owed to the child a state-imposed legal duty of support."
>
> *King* v. *Smith*, at 329.

By considering income as available to needy children when it may in fact be unavailable, Connecticut seeks to disqualify otherwise eligible children from AFDC in violation of Section 602(a) (7) of Title 42 of the United States Code. For this Court recognized that Section 602(a) (7) requires a state, in determining need, to consider only income and resources which are *actually* available to the applicant on a regular basis. *King* v. *Smith*, at 319 n.16. Since a state must exclude "from consideration resources which are merely assumed to be available to the needy individual," *id.*, Section 17-87(a) of the Connecticut General Statutes impermissibly denies AFDC to dependent children. *King* v. *Smith* therefore invalidates any attempt by Connecticut to disqualify needy children from AFDC merely because of the presence in their home of a person not legally obligated to support them.

This Court's decision in *King* v. *Smith* mandates the invalidation of the stepparent provisions of Section 17-87(a) of the Connecticut General Statutes. The appellees' Motion to Affirm should therefore be granted.

II. In King v. Smith, 392 U.S. 309 (1968), This Court Expressly Approved Regulations of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare Which Invalidate the Stepparent Provisions of Section 17-87(a) of the Connecticut General Statutes.

In *King* v. *Smith*, 392 U.S. 309, 317 (1968), the Supreme Court held that a state AFDC plan must comply "with rules and regulations promulgated by HEW." Prior to the decision in *King* v. *Smith*, HEW had issued regulations which prohibited appellant's attribution of a stepparent's income to needy children regardless of its actual availability. These regulations were examined and expressly approved in *King* v. *Smith*, at 319 n.16.

The HEW regulations approved by this Court in *King* v. *Smith* were precursors of the regulation relied upon below. 45 C.F.R. §203.1, 33 Fed. Reg. 11290 (1968). Those portions of the HEW regulation upon which the opinion of the court below was based, Appellant's Jurisdictional Statement at 16-17, simply reenact earlier requirements already approved by this Court. *King* v. *Smith*, at 319 n.16. Since a Connecticut stepparent has no legal obligation whatsoever to support his stepchildren, his income may not "be considered available for children in the household in absence of proof of actual contributions." 45 C.F.R. §203.1(b), 33 Fed. Reg. 11290 (1968). Because Section 17-87(a) of the Connecticut General Statutes clearly conflicts with HEW regulations already adjudicated as valid, the appellees' Motion to Affirm should be granted.

III. The 1968 Amendment to 42 U.S.C. §602(a)(7) Does Not Authorize a State to Assume That a Stepparent's Income Is Available to Stepchildren Residing in the Home.

Section 202 of the 1968 Amendments to the Social Security Act, Pub. L. No. 90-248, §202 (1968), does not authorize the appellant to assume the availability of a stepparent's income to stepchildren whom he is not legally obligated to support. The primary purpose of this amendment is to create an earnings exemption [42 U.S.C. §602(a)(8) (1964 ed., Supp. III)] for recipients and certain "essential persons" [42 U.S.C. §602(a)(7) (1964 ed., Supp. III)]. S.R. 744, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. at 155, 158 (1967); H.R. Rep. No. 544, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. at 174 (1967).

Section 202 amends 42 U.S.C. §602(a)(7) as follows:

> "Except as may otherwise be provided in clause 8, [the State plan shall] provide that the State agency shall, in determining need, take into consideration any other income and resources of any child or relative claiming aid to families with dependent children, *or of any other individual (living in the same home as such child and relative) whose needs the State determines should be considered in determining the need of the child or relative claiming such aid*, as well as any expenses reasonably attributable to the earning of any such income . . ." (emphasis supplied)

As the court below explained in great detail, an "essential person" is ineligible in his own right for public assistance. If, however, he is essential to the well-being of a recipient of public assistance, his needs may, at the option of the recipient, be included in the assistance budget. The court below recognized that Section 202 comfortably coexists with HEW's rule, approved by this Court, against income presumptions. *Solman*

v. *Shapiro*, at 19-22. The court further noted that a Connecticut stepparent is not an "essential person." *Id.* In computing the amount of the AFDC budget, the Connecticut State Welfare Department does not meet the needs of a stepparent. 1 Conn. State Welfare Manual §345.3, at 2-3. If the stepparent is unemployed or incapacitated he is eligible in his own right for assistance, and is not an "essential person." *Id.*

Although *King* v. *Smith* did not explicitly refer to Section 202, this Court considered related Sections of the 1968 Amendments in some detail. *King* v. *Smith*, at 324-326, 331-333. Despite its awareness of the 1968 Amendments, this Court held that HEW's interpretation of Section 602(a) (7) of Title 42 "properly excludes from consideration resources which are merely assumed to be available to the needy individual." *King* v. *Smith*, at 319 n.16. Appellees cannot credit the notion that *King* v. *Smith* was undercut at the moment of its publication by an Amendment of which this Court was doubtless aware. Beyond question, Section 202 of the 1968 Amendments meshes perfectly with this Court's rule against income presumptions.

IV. The Cases Upon Which Appellant Relies Are Inapposite.

Appellant relies heavily in his Jurisdictional Statement upon the case of *Tartaglio* v. *Department of Institutions and Agencies, Division of Public Welfare*, 102 N.J. Super. 592, 246 A.2d 483 (1968), *cert. denied*, 89 S. Ct. 1594 (1969). This reliance is misplaced, for the denial of certiorari hardly indicates this Court's opinion as to the merits of a controversy. *Maryland* v. *Baltimore Radio Show, Inc.*, 338 U.S. 912, 917-919 (1950). Moreover, neither the HEW regulation adopted after *King* v. *Smith*, 45 C.F.R. §203.1, 33 Fed. Reg. 11290 (1968), nor the

HEW requirements approved by this Court, 392 U.S. at 319 n.16, was referred to in the *Tartaglio* opinion or introduced at the trial level.[3] The *Tartaglio* case cannot aid the appellant.

Appellant further relies upon the case of *Lewis* v. *Stark*, F. Supp. (N.D. Cal., 1968), CCH Poverty Law Reporter 10,543. The *Lewis* decision, however, raises issues that are not involved in this case. In California a stepfather or "man assuming the role of spouse" (MARS) is under a legal obligation to support children in the home if they would otherwise "be needy children eligible for aid . . ." Cal. Welf. & Inst. Code §11351. This duty of support, as noted by plaintiffs in *Lewis*, is of a wholly different and lesser degree than the duty of a natural parent toward his children. California assumes that the resources of such a person are available for the support of children in the home. The California practice is inconsistent with the requiurement of HEW. 45 C.F.R. §203.1, 33 Fed. Reg. 11290 (1968). The district court ruled invalid HEW's requirement that the support liability be of general applicability, *Lewis* v. *Stark*, at 10,546-7, and upheld the California statute, stating:

> "If the state assumed the availability of resources whose application to the needs of the family were not required by law, that would present a different case."
>
> *Id.* at 10,549.

In Connecticut, of course, a stepparent has no legal obligation at all to support his stepchildren. While appellees here agree with plaintiffs in *Lewis*, that the availability of a stepparent's income ought to be assumed only where his support

---

[3] The issue of whether a stepparent's income can be assumed as available for his stepchildren is now being litigated in New Jersey. *Anderson* v. *McCorkle*, Civ. Act. No. 1386-68 (D.C. N.J.).

obligation is equivalent to that of a natural parent, the validity of this HEW requirement is not at issue here. The appellant's reliance on *Lewis* is therefore misplaced.

V. The Court Below Did Not Award Retroactive Damages to Appellees, But Properly Remanded the Question of Damages to the Connecticut State Welfare Department.

The court below awarded no damages to appellees, but rather remanded their prayer for damages to the Connecticut Department of Welfare for determination in light of its own regulations and those of HEW. 1 Conn. State Welfare Manual §6300(7); IV Handbook of Public Assistance Admin. §6200(k).[4] Therefore, any award of retroactive benefits will not be made by the district court, but rather pursuant to the decision of an agency of the State. *Solman* v. *Shapiro*, at 23-24.

---

[4] The court's procedure was proper, particularly since AFDC benefits are statutory entitlements. *Smith* v. *King*, 277 F. Supp. 31, 38 (M.D. Ala., 1967), *aff'd*, *King* v. *Smith*, 392 U.S. 309 (1968); *Thompson* v. *Shapiro*, 270 F. Supp. 331 (D.Conn., 1967), *aff'd*, *Shapiro* v. *Thompson*, 89 S. Ct. 1322 (1969); *Board of Social Welfare* v. *County of Los Angeles*, 27 Cal. 2d 81, 162 P.2d 630 (1945).

CONCLUSION

Appellees' Motion to Affirm should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID M. LESSER
New Haven Legal Assistance
Association, Inc.
605 Congress Avenue
New Haven, Connecticut

THOMAS JAY SOLOMON
Waterbury Legal Aid & Reference
Service, Inc.
35 Field Street
Waterbury, Connecticut

WILLIAM H. CLENDENEN, JR.
New Haven Legal Assistance
Association, Inc.
795 Grand Avenue
New Haven, Connecticut

FRANCIS X. DINEEN
New Haven Legal Assistance
Association, Inc.
169 Church Street
New Haven, Connecticut

INDEX

PAGE

Article from New Haven Journal Courier, June 4, 1969 3a

New Haven Journal Courier, June 4, 1969, at 1, col. 4.

WIDE CURBS ON WELFARE APPROVED

BY GERALD MCKIERNAN
State Capitol Reporter

HARTFORD — All that remains for an official closing of the state Welfare Department's budget is the signature of Gov. John N. Dempsey.

The state House of Representatives gave final legislative approval Tuesday night to what has been termed the omnibus welfare bill which:

— Closes the Welfare Department budget and ends no-ceiling spending;

— Eliminates the Cost of Living Commission and assigns that group's task to the welfare commissioner who will be required to report to the legislature's Interim Welfare Committee at six-month intervals;

— Lowers from 21 to 19 the top age of eligibility for Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) programs;

— Sets higher limits on how much a family on welfare can earn in the course of a year — family of two, $3,200; three, $3,800; and four, $4,400; and

— Creates an executive committee of five to nine members charged with implementing the recommendations of the A.D. Little Co. which recently studied the Welfare Department.

On the way toward passage of the bill, the House defeated a Republican amendment (requiring stepfathers, if they are fi-

(See WELFARE Page 19)

nancially able, to contribute to the support of welfare families) and in effect, squelched three amendments which never were offered by Rep. Robert Oliver, D-New Haven.

When the time came for the lower chamber to consider the New Haven Democrat's proposals — aimed at maintaining the unemployed parents' program and reevaluating the federal Title 19 regarding Medicaid — the sophomore legislator was not in his seat.

Majority Leader Carl Ajello asked the speaker, William Ratchford of Danbury, to hold the amendments over until Oliver returned.

Ratchford asked the House if there was any objection to this move and hearing none, asked if there were further comments on the bill. Dr. Morris Cohen, D-Bloomfield, the House chairman of the Public Welfare and Humane Institutions Committee, got to his feet but sat down when met by a large chorus of "sit down Doc."

Ratchford then asked if there was further comment and in the silence asked for a vote on the bill — it passed a voice vote with no dissent.

Moments later, Oliver returned to the hall and was met by Ajello in the well of the House. The New Havener repeated, "It isn't fair," but the majority leader merely shrugged his shoulders.

The GOP amendment I, introduced by Rep. Arline Ryan, R-Branford, was hotly debated and opposed by Rep. Bruce Morris, D-New Haven, who asked that the state be required to go out and find the original father, "the one who made them" (the dependent children).

Some Democrats asked what would happen if the Republican amendment was adopted and were informed by Ratchford that a disagreeing action (with the Senate which had already approved the bill) would occur and a committee on conference would have to be formed.

Rep. John Prete, D-West Haven, doubted the wisdom of such a move and noted, "I don't know how many times we can try the Senate." in an obvious reference to the number of times the two Democratic chambers have disagreed this legislative year.

With Republican deflections and heavy Democratic support — the amendment lost on a roll call vote, 103-55.

In essence, the bill would not completely close the Welfare Department's budget in that the commissioner would still be allowed to go to the Finance Advisory Committee for needed funds.

Considering the bill, however, he could expect rough sledding at such a session.

(emphasis added)

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

October Term, 1969.

SHAPIRO, COMMISSIONER OF WELFARE *v.* SOLMAN ET AL.

APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT.

No. 215. Decided October 13, 1969.

PER CURIAM.

The motion to affirm is granted and the judgment is affirmed. See *King* v. *Smith*, 392 U. S. 309.